

Continuous regularized Gauss-Newton-type algorithm for nonlinear ill-posed equations with simultaneous updates of inverse derivative

Alexander G. Ramm
E-mail: ramm@math.ksu.edu
Department of Mathematics
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 66506, U.S.A.

Alexandra B. Smirnova
E-mail: smirn@cs.gsu.edu
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30303, U.S.A.

A new continuous regularized Gauss-Newton-type method with simultaneous updates of the operator $(F'^(x(t))F'(x(t)) + \varepsilon(t)I)^{-1}$ for solving nonlinear ill-posed equations in a Hilbert space is proposed. A convergence theorem is proved. An attractive and novel feature of the proposed method is the absence of the assumptions about the location of the spectrum of the operator $F'(x)$. The absence of such assumptions is made possible by a source-type condition.*

Key words: nonlinear ill-posed problems, continuous regularization, integral inequality, Fréchet derivative, Gauss-Newton's method.

AMS subject classification: 65J15, 58C15, 47H17

1. Introduction

Consider a nonlinear operator equation

$$(1.1) \quad F(x) = 0, \quad F : H \rightarrow H,$$

in a real Hilbert space H . We suppose here that equation (1.1) is solvable (not necessarily uniquely), and the operator F is twice Fréchet differentiable without such structural assumptions as monotonicity, invertibility of F' etc.

In the theory of ill-posed problems various discrete and continuous methods based on a regularization are known. A principal point in the numerical implementation of regularized Newton's and Gauss-Newton's procedures is the inversion of the operators $(F'(x) + \varepsilon I)$ and $(F'^*(x)F'(x) + \varepsilon I)$ respectively [2], [3], [5]. Such an inversion for certain operators is a nontrivial task. Moreover, the inversion decreases the accuracy of computations.

For well-posed equations (i.e., in the case when the Fréchet derivative operator $F'(x)$ is boundedly invertible in a ball, which contains one of the solutions) several approaches are taken in order to reduce the cost associated with the storage and inversion of $F'(x)$ in Newton's scheme (or $F'^*(x)F'(x)$ in Gauss-Newton's scheme). Iterative techniques for

linear systems, like 'conjugate gradient', can be applied to compute an approximation to the Newton step $s_n := x_{n+1} - x_n$, yielding an inexact, or truncated, Newton's method. Such a method does not explicitly require the operator $F'(x)$. Instead, it requires only applications of $F'(x)$ to certain elements. See [6], [11] or ([9], p.136).

Another approach is to replace the exact Fréchet derivative by an approximation obtained from current and previous values of $F(x)$. In this case, only $F(x_{n+1})$ and $F(x_n)$ are required. This generates the secant method ([7], p.201). Perhaps the most popular secant method is the BFGS method, which was discovered independently by Broyden, Fletcher, Goldfarb, and Shanno in 1970. To implement the BFGS, given an approximation J_n to $F'(x_n)$, one first computes

$$s_n := x_{n+1} - x_n \quad \text{and} \quad y_n := F(x_{n+1}) - F(x_n).$$

One then gets an approximation to $F'(x_{n+1})$:

$$J_{n+1} = J_n - \frac{(J_n s_n)(J_n s_n)^T}{s_n^T J_n s_n} + \frac{y_n y_n^T}{y_n^T s_n}.$$

If J_n is symmetric positive definite and $y_n^T s_n > 0$, then J_{n+1} will also be symmetric positive definite. In the finite dimensional well-posed case, under standard assumptions, the BFGS method is guaranteed to be superlinearly convergent.

BFGS has a limited memory variant ([9], p.224), which requires no explicit matrix storage for the approximate derivative. It is based on the recursion for the inverse

$$J_{n+1}^{-1} = \left(I - \frac{s_n y_n^T}{y_n^T s_n} \right) J_n^{-1} \left(I - \frac{y_n s_n^T}{y_n^T s_n} \right) + \frac{s_n s_n^T}{y_n^T s_n}.$$

In [1] the following continuous Newton-type algorithm for solving nonlinear well-posed operator equations is investigated

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= -J(t)F(x(t)), \quad x(0) = x_0 \in H, \quad J(0) \in L(H), \\ \dot{J}(t) &= -\rho^2 [F'^*(x(t))F'(x(t))J(t) + J(t)F'(x(t))F'^*(x(t))] + 2\rho^2 F'^*(x(t)). \end{aligned}$$

The theorem establishing convergence with the exponential rate is proved for the above procedure.

In many important applications the Fréchet derivative operator is not boundedly invertible: this is an ill-posed case. In order to deal with this difficulty, we propose a novel continuous algorithm with simultaneous updates of $(F'^*(x(t))F'(x(t)) + \varepsilon(t)I)^{-1}$ and prove a convergence theorem. The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we introduce the algorithm and also state two Lemmas. In section 3 the main convergence result is established. An attractive feature of this result (formulas (2.3)-(2.4) in section 2) is the absence of the assumptions about the location of the spectrum of the operator $F'(x)$. For example, in [4] the operator $F'(x)$ was assumed nonnegative, which is a strong assumption about location of its spectrum. One may generalize the methods and results of [4] to the case of the operators for which $\Re F'(x) \geq 0$, which still imposes a restriction on the location of the spectrum of $F'(x)$. The absence of such assumptions in our paper is made possible by the conditions 5) and 6) of Theorem 3.1 in section 3.

2. The Initial Value Problem and Some Auxiliary Results

Consider continuously regularized Gauss-Newton's procedure for solving equation (1.1):

$$(2.1) \quad \dot{x}(t) = -[F'^*(x(t))F'(x(t)) + \varepsilon(t)I]^{-1} [F'^*(x(t))F(x(t)) + \varepsilon(t)(x(t) - x_0)],$$

where $\varepsilon(t) > 0$, $x_0 \in H$, and I is an identity operator. The reader may consult [2] and [3] for a convergence analysis of (2.1). Problem (2.1) is equivalent to the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= -Q(t)[F'^*(x(t))F(x(t)) + \varepsilon(t)(x(t) - x_0)], \\ (2.2) \quad [F'^*(x(t))F'(x(t)) + \varepsilon(t)I]Q(t) - I &= 0, \quad Q(t) \in L(H). \end{aligned}$$

Solve equation (2.2) by using continuous simple iteration scheme. We arrive at the initial value problem

$$(2.3) \quad \dot{x}(t) = -B(t)[F'^*(x(t))F(x(t)) + \varepsilon(t)(x(t) - x_0)],$$

$$(2.4) \quad \dot{B}(t) = -[(F'^*(x(t))F'(x(t)) + \varepsilon(t)I)B(t) - I],$$

$$x(0) = x_0 \in H, \quad B(0) \in L(H), \quad 0 < \varepsilon(t) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow +\infty.$$

The following lemma about the inversion of a nonlinear differential inequality was first stated and proved in [3].

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\gamma(t), \sigma(t), \beta(t) \in C[0, +\infty)$. If there exists a positive function $\mu(t) \in C^1[0, +\infty)$ such that*

$$(2.5) \quad 0 \leq \sigma(t) \leq \frac{\mu(t)}{2} \left(\gamma(t) - \frac{\dot{\mu}(t)}{\mu(t)} \right), \quad \beta(t) \leq \frac{1}{2\mu(t)} \left(\gamma(t) - \frac{\dot{\mu}(t)}{\mu(t)} \right), \quad \mu(0)v(0) < 1,$$

then a nonnegative solution to the following inequality

$$(2.6) \quad \dot{v}(t) \leq -\gamma(t)v(t) + \sigma(t)v^2(t) + \beta(t)$$

satisfies the estimate:

$$(2.7) \quad 0 \leq v(t) < \frac{1}{\mu(t)}.$$

Now, we formulate the second lemma, which is an operator-theoretical version of the well-known Gronwall inequality:

Lemma 2.2. *Let*

$$(2.8) \quad \frac{dV}{dt} + A(t)V(t) = G(t), \quad V(0) = V_0,$$

where $A(t), G(t), V(t) \in L(H)$, and H is a real Hilbert space. If there exists $\gamma(t) > 0$ such that

$$(2.9) \quad (A(t)h, h) \geq \gamma(t)\|h\|^2 \quad \forall h \in H,$$

then

$$(2.10) \quad \|V(t)\| \leq e^{-\int_0^t \gamma(p)dp} \left[\int_0^t \|G(s)\| e^{\int_0^s \gamma(p)dp} ds + \|V(0)\| \right].$$

Proof. Take any $h \in H$. Since H is a real Hilbert space one has:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|V(t)h\|^2 &= \left(\frac{dV}{dt} h, V(t)h \right) \\
 &= -(A(t)V(t)h, V(t)h) + (G(t)h, V(t)h) \\
 (2.11) \quad &\leq -\gamma(t) \|V(t)h\|^2 + \|G(t)\| \|h\| \|V(t)h\|
 \end{aligned}$$

Denote $v(t) := \|V(t)h\|$. Inequality (2.11) implies

$$(2.12) \quad v\dot{v} \leq -\gamma(t)v^2 + \|G(t)\| \|h\| v.$$

Divide this inequality by the nonnegative v and get a linear first-order differential inequality from which one can derive the desired inequality (2.10). Lemma 2.3 is proved. $\square$

3. The Convergence Theorem

Theorem 3.1. Let H be a real Hilbert space, $F : H \rightarrow H$.

1) Assume that $0 < \varepsilon(t) \in C^1[0, +\infty)$ converges to zero monotonically and

$$(3.1) \quad |\dot{\varepsilon}(t)| \leq b\varepsilon^2(t) \quad \text{for any } t \in [0, +\infty),$$

where $b > 0$ is a constant.

2) Suppose problem (1.1) is solvable (not necessarily uniquely) and $\hat{x}$ is its solution.

3) There exists a positive number R such that F is twice Fréchet differentiable in a closed ball $U(\hat{x}, R\varepsilon(0)) := \{x : x \in H, \|x - \hat{x}\| \leq R\varepsilon(0)\}$ and

$$\|F'(x)\| \leq N_1, \quad \|F''(x)\| \leq N_2 \quad \text{for all } x \in U(\hat{x}, R\varepsilon(0)).$$

4) Let the following inequality be satisfied

$$(3.2) \quad k + b\varepsilon(0) < 1,$$

where $k := 2N_1N_2R + b + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\| + \|I - B(0)[F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x}) + \varepsilon(0)I]\|$.

5) For an initial approximation point x_0 the source-type condition holds

$$(3.3) \quad x_0 \in U(\hat{x}, R\varepsilon(0)) \cap [\hat{x} + \text{Ran}(F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x}))],$$

where $\text{Ran}(F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x}))$ is the range of the linear operator $F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x})$, and for some w , such that $\hat{x} - x_0 = F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x})w$, one has:

$$(3.4) \quad \frac{1}{R} \leq \frac{3N_1N_2(1 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)}{1 - k - b\varepsilon(0)} < \min \left\{ \frac{1 - k - b\varepsilon(0)}{2(k + 2 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)\|w\|}, \frac{\varepsilon(0)}{\|x(0) - \hat{x}\|} \right\}.$$

Then

the solution $(x(t), B(t))$ to problem (2.3)-(2.4) exists for all $t \in [0, +\infty)$ and

$$(3.5) \quad \|x(t) - \hat{x}\| < R\varepsilon(t).$$

Remark 3.2 There are many $\varepsilon(t)$ satisfying condition 1) of Theorem 3.1. For example, one may take $\varepsilon(t) = c_0(c_1 + t)^{-a}$, where c_0 and c_1 are positive constants and $a \in (0, 1]$.

Remark 3.3 Note that assumption (3.3) is not algorithmically verifiable. However, practitioners may try different x_0 and choose the one for which the algorithm works better, that is, convergence is more rapid and the algorithm is more stable.

If $F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x})$ is compact and the null space $N(F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x})) = \{0\}$, then the range $\text{Ran}(F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x}))$ is dense in H , so in any neighborhood of $\hat{x}$ there are points x_0 for which (3.3) holds. On the other hand, since $F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x})$ is compact, the set $\text{R}(F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x}))$ is

not closed. Thus, in the same neighborhood there are also points x_0 for which (3.3) fails to hold. In general, in order to get a convergence theorem in an ill-posed case one needs some additional assumptions on the Fréchet derivative of the operator F , for example condition (3.3), or some other condition of this type (see e.g., [8], condition (2.11)).

Remark 3.4 By the assumption 4) of Theorem 3.1 the first inequality in (3.4) is equivalent to the following one:

$$(3.6) \quad 3N_1N_2R(1 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|) \geq 1 - 2N_1N_2R - b - \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\| - \|\Lambda(0)\| - b\varepsilon(0),$$

where $\|\Lambda(0)\| := \|I - B(0)[F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x}) + \varepsilon(0)I]\|$. Inequality (3.6) yields

$$(3.7) \quad R \geq \frac{1 - b - \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\| - \|\Lambda(0)\| - b\varepsilon(0)}{(5 + 3\varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)N_1N_2}.$$

If one takes

$$(3.8) \quad R := \frac{1 - b - \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\| - \|\Lambda(0)\| - b\varepsilon(0)}{(5 + 3\varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)N_1N_2},$$

then condition (3.2) is equivalent to

$$(3.9) \quad b + \|\Lambda(0)\| + b\varepsilon(0)[1 + \|B(0)\|] + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|[\varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\| + \|\Lambda(0)\| + \varepsilon(0)] < 1.$$

For inequality (3.9) to hold one has to have b , $\|\Lambda(0)\|$ and $\varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|$ sufficiently small. The second inequality in (3.4) holds if $\|w\|$ and $\|x_0 - \hat{x}\|$ are sufficiently small. Such a priori assumptions are typical for the methods of solving nonlinear problems, in particular, for the Newton-type methods.

Remark 3.5 In practice, algorithm (2.3)-(2.4) proved to be efficient. In order to test (2.3)-(2.4) numerically, we considered a two-dimensional inverse gravimetry problem (see [2], [10]) and the Feigenbaum equation (see [3], equation (5.1)). The goal of the experiments was to investigate the choice of the regularization function $\varepsilon(t)$ in (2.3)-(2.4) and to compare two continuous methods: (2.3)-(2.4) and (2.1). Analyzing the results of practical computations we arrived at the following conclusions:

1. Continuously regularized Gauss-Newton's scheme (2.1) tends to do well initially, until the value of a regularization function $\varepsilon(t)$ is not very small. Continuous procedure (2.3)-(2.4) is more stable, and allows one to get the approximate solution with better accuracy.
2. The best numerical results for (2.3)-(2.4) are obtained with $\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon(0)(1 + t)^{-1}$. An approximate range of possible values for $\varepsilon(0)$ appears to be from 0.001 to 0.1; for larger values the accuracy is lower, and for smaller values the process does not converge.
3. An important task that should be studied next is the stability of the solution towards the noise in the data, and the choice of an optimal regularization parameter (the stopping time in our case) such that the method converges to the solution of (1.1) when the noise level tends to zero. Also one has to analyze under what assumptions on F and x_0 the convergence of the continuous process (2.3)-(2.4) implies the convergence of the corresponding discrete process, obtained by the Euler or the Runge-Kutta finite difference methods.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. The main part of the proof (Steps 1-3) is to show that if $(x(t), B(t))$ is a solution to (2.3)-(2.4), then $\|x(t) - \hat{x}\| < R\varepsilon(t)$. Assume the converse. By (3.4) one has the inequality $\|x(0) - \hat{x}\| < R\varepsilon(0)$. Therefore there exists a $\tau \in [0, +\infty)$, such

that

$$(3.10) \quad \|x(t) - \hat{x}\| < R\varepsilon(t) \quad \forall t \in [0, \tau] \quad \text{and} \quad \|x(\tau) - \hat{x}\| = R\varepsilon(\tau).$$

Step 1. In this step we derive some estimates (see (3.11)), (3.13) and (3.14) below) for

$$\|B(t)\|, \quad \|I - B(t)[F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x}) + \varepsilon(t)I]\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|B(t)F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x})\|.$$

We assume below that $t \in [0, \tau]$. Applying Lemma 2.2 with

$$V(t) := B(t), \quad A(t) := F'^*(x(t))F'(x(t)) + \varepsilon(t)I, \quad G(t) := I,$$

one gets

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \|B(t)\| &\leq e^{-\int_0^t \varepsilon(p)dp} \left[\int_0^t e^{\int_0^s \varepsilon(p)dp} ds + \|B(0)\| \right] \leq e^{-\int_0^t \varepsilon(p)dp} \left[\frac{1}{\varepsilon(t)} \int_0^t \varepsilon(s) e^{\int_0^s \varepsilon(p)dp} ds + \|B(0)\| \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon(t)} \left[1 - e^{-\int_0^t \varepsilon(p)dp} \right] + \|B(0)\| e^{-\int_0^t \varepsilon(p)dp} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon(t)} + \|B(0)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Introduce the notation

$$(3.12) \quad \Lambda(t) := I - B(t)[F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x}) + \varepsilon(t)I].$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Lambda}(t) &= -\dot{B}(t)[F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x}) + \varepsilon(t)I] - B(t)\dot{\varepsilon}(t) \\ &= [F'^*(x(t))F'(x(t))B(t) - I + \varepsilon(t)B(t)][F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x}) + \varepsilon(t)I] - B(t)\dot{\varepsilon}(t) \\ &= [F'^*(x(t))F'(x(t)) + \varepsilon(t)I](I - \Lambda(t)) - [F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x}) + \varepsilon(t)I] - B(t)\dot{\varepsilon}(t) \\ &= -[F'^*(x(t))F'(x(t)) + \varepsilon(t)I]\Lambda(t) + F'^*(x(t))F'(x(t)) - F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x}) - B(t)\dot{\varepsilon}(t). \end{aligned}$$

Use Lemma 2.2 once again, with

$$\begin{aligned} V(t) &:= \Lambda(t), \quad A(t) := F'^*(x(t))F'(x(t)) + \varepsilon(t)I, \\ G(t) &:= F'^*(x(t))F'(x(t)) - F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x}) - B(t)\dot{\varepsilon}(t). \end{aligned}$$

From the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|F'^*(h)F'(h) - F'^*(y)F'(y)\| &= \|F'^*(h)[F'(h) - F'(y)] + [F'^*(h) - F'^*(y)]F'(y)\| \\ &\leq 2N_1N_2\|h - y\| \quad \text{for any } h, y \in U(\hat{x}, R\varepsilon(0)), \end{aligned}$$

and from (3.11), (3.10), (3.1) and condition 3) of Theorem 3.1 one obtains:

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\Lambda(t)\| &\leq e^{-\int_0^t \varepsilon(p)dp} \left\{ \int_0^t \left[2N_1N_2\|x(s) - \hat{x}\| + \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon(s)} + \left(\|B(0)\| - \frac{1}{\varepsilon(s)} \right) e^{-\int_0^s \varepsilon(p)dp} \right) |\dot{\varepsilon}(s)| \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. e^{\int_0^s \varepsilon(p)dp} ds + \|\Lambda(0)\| \right\} \leq e^{-\int_0^t \varepsilon(p)dp} \left[(2N_1N_2R + b) \int_0^t \varepsilon(s) e^{\int_0^s \varepsilon(p)dp} ds + \int_0^t \left(\|B(0)\| - \frac{1}{\varepsilon(s)} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. |\dot{\varepsilon}(s)| ds + \|\Lambda(0)\| \right] = (2N_1N_2R + b) \left[1 - e^{-\int_0^t \varepsilon(p)dp} \right] + \left(\|B(0)\| - \frac{1}{\varepsilon(0)} \right) (\varepsilon(0) - \varepsilon(t)) + \\ &\quad + \|\Lambda(0)\| e^{-\int_0^t \varepsilon(p)dp} \leq 2N_1N_2R + b + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\| + \|\Lambda(0)\| := k \end{aligned}$$

Now denote $D(t) := B(t)F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x})$. Then by (3.13) $\|\Lambda(t)\| = \|I - D(t) - B(t)\varepsilon(t)\| \leq k$, and therefore by (3.11)

$$(3.14) \quad \|D(t)\| \leq k + 2 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|.$$

Step 2. In this step we derive the differential inequality (see (3.20) below).

Since H is a real Hilbert space one has:

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|x(t) - \hat{x}\|^2 = (\dot{x}, x(t) - \hat{x}) = -(B(t)[F'^*(x(t))F(x(t)) + \varepsilon(t)(x(t) - x_0)], x(t) - \hat{x}).$$

One gets

$$(3.15) \quad F(x(t)) = F'(\hat{x})(x(t) - \hat{x}) + K(x(t), x(t) - \hat{x}, x(t) - \hat{x}),$$

where

$$(3.16) \quad \|K(h, y, z)\| \leq \frac{N_2}{2} \|y\| \|z\| \quad \text{for any } h \in U(\hat{x}, R\varepsilon(0)), \quad y, z \in H.$$

Thus, (3.15), (3.16) and (3.11) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|x(t) - \hat{x}\|^2 &\leq -(B(t)F'^*(x(t))F'(\hat{x})(x(t) - \hat{x}), x(t) - \hat{x}) - \varepsilon(t)(B(t)(x(t) - x_0), x(t) - \hat{x}) \\ &+ \frac{N_1 N_2 (1 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)}{2\varepsilon(t)} \|x(t) - \hat{x}\|^3 = -(B(t)(F'(x(t)) - F'(\hat{x}))^* F'(\hat{x})(x(t) - \hat{x}), x(t) - \hat{x}) \\ &- (B(t)[F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x}) + \varepsilon(t)I](x(t) - \hat{x}), x(t) - \hat{x}) - \varepsilon(t)(B(t)(\hat{x} - x_0), x(t) - \hat{x}) \\ &+ \frac{N_1 N_2 (1 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)}{2\varepsilon(t)} \|x(t) - \hat{x}\|^3. \end{aligned}$$

From (3.12) one gets

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} &-(B(t)[F'^*(\hat{x})F'(\hat{x}) + \varepsilon(t)I](x(t) - \hat{x}), x(t) - \hat{x}) = -\|x(t) - \hat{x}\|^2 \\ &+ (\Lambda(t)(x(t) - \hat{x}), x(t) - \hat{x}). \end{aligned}$$

By estimate (3.11)

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} &-(B(t)(F'(x(t)) - F'(\hat{x}))^* F'(\hat{x})(x(t) - \hat{x}), x(t) - \hat{x}) \\ &\leq \frac{N_1 N_2 (1 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)}{\varepsilon(t)} \|x(t) - \hat{x}\|^3. \end{aligned}$$

Condition 5) of Theorem 3.1 implies:

$$(3.19) \quad -\varepsilon(t)(B(t)(\hat{x} - x_0), x(t) - \hat{x}) = -\varepsilon(t)(D(t)w, x(t) - \hat{x}).$$

From (3.17), (3.18), (3.19), (3.13), (3.14) one concludes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|x(t) - \hat{x}\|^2 &\leq \frac{3N_1 N_2 (1 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)}{2\varepsilon(t)} \|x(t) - \hat{x}\|^3 - (1 - k)\|x(t) - \hat{x}\|^2 \\ &+ \varepsilon(t)(k + 2 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|) \|w\| \|x(t) - \hat{x}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Let $v(t) := \|x(t) - \hat{x}\|$. Then we arrive at the inequality

$$(3.20) \quad \dot{v} \leq -(1 - k)v + \frac{3N_1 N_2 (1 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)}{2\varepsilon(t)} v^2 + \varepsilon(t)(k + 2 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|) \|w\|.$$

Step 3. In this step we choose $\mu(t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, such that assumptions (2.5) of Lemma 2.1 are satisfied for inequality (3.20), so that the conclusion $\|x(t) - \hat{x}\| < \frac{1}{\mu(t)}$ holds.

Choose $\mu(t) \in C^1[0, +\infty)$ to satisfy conditions (2.5) of Lemma 2.1 with

$$(3.21) \quad \gamma(t) := 1 - k, \quad \sigma(t) := \frac{3N_1N_2(1 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)}{2\varepsilon(t)},$$

$$(3.22) \quad \beta(t) := \varepsilon(t)(k + 2 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|) \|w\|.$$

Take $\mu(t) = \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon(t)}$, where $\lambda > 0$ is a constant. Then (2.5) can be rewritten as follows:

$$(3.23) \quad \frac{3N_1N_2(1 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)}{2\varepsilon(t)} \leq \frac{\lambda}{2\varepsilon(t)} \left(1 - k - \frac{|\dot{\varepsilon}(t)|}{\varepsilon(t)} \right),$$

$$(3.24) \quad \varepsilon(t)(k + 2 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|) \|w\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon(t)}{2\lambda} \left(1 - k - \frac{|\dot{\varepsilon}(t)|}{\varepsilon(t)} \right),$$

$$(3.25) \quad \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon(0)} \|x(0) - \hat{x}\| < 1.$$

Inequality (3.23) is equivalent to the following one

$$(3.26) \quad \lambda \geq \frac{3N_1N_2(1 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)}{1 - k - \frac{|\dot{\varepsilon}(t)|}{\varepsilon(t)}}.$$

If one takes

$$(3.27) \quad \lambda := \frac{3N_1N_2(1 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)}{1 - k - b\varepsilon(0)},$$

then (3.26) follows from (3.27) and from conditions 1) and 4) of Theorem 3.1. Assumption (3.4) of Theorem 3.1 implies that

$$(3.28) \quad \frac{3N_1N_2(1 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)}{1 - k - b\varepsilon(0)} < \frac{1 - k - b\varepsilon(0)}{2(k + 2 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)\|w\|}.$$

For λ defined by (3.27) inequality (3.28) can be written as

$$(3.29) \quad \lambda < \frac{1 - k - b\varepsilon(0)}{2(k + 2 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)\|w\|}.$$

From (3.29) one obtains (3.24).

Finally, from (3.4) one concludes that

$$(3.30) \quad \frac{3N_1N_2(1 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)}{1 - k - b\varepsilon(0)} < \frac{\varepsilon(0)}{\|x(0) - \hat{x}\|},$$

which is equivalent to (3.25) for λ defined by (3.27).

Hence, by Lemma 2.1, one obtains:

$$\|x(t) - \hat{x}\| < \frac{\varepsilon(t)}{\lambda}.$$

By (3.27) and (3.4)

$$\frac{\|x(t) - \hat{x}\|}{\varepsilon(t)} < \frac{1 - k - b\varepsilon(0)}{3N_1N_2(1 + \varepsilon(0)\|B(0)\|)} \leq R \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, \tau],$$

which contradicts (3.10). Thus $\|x(t) - \hat{x}\| < R\varepsilon(t)$ whenever $x(t)$ is defined.

Step 4. Now let us show that there exists the unique solution to (2.3)-(2.4) on $[0, +\infty)$. The initial value problem (2.3)-(2.4) is equivalent to the integral equations:

$$(3.31) \quad x(t) = x_0 + \int_0^t B(s)\Phi(s, x(s))ds, \quad x_0 \in H,$$

$$(3.32) \quad B(t) = B(0) + \int_0^t [\varphi(s, x(s))B(s) + I]ds, \quad B(0) \in L(H),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(s, x) &:= -[F'^*(x)F(x) + \varepsilon(s)(x - x_0)], \\ \varphi(s, x) &:= -[F'^*(x)F'(x) + \varepsilon(s)I]. \end{aligned}$$

We have already proved that if for some positive number T the solution $(x(t), B(t))$ to problem (2.3)-(2.4) exists on $[0, T]$, then $x(t)$ and $B(t)$ are bounded in the norm on $[0, T]$. Therefore, since the integrands in (3.31) and (3.32) are Lipschitz-continuous, the standard argument yields existence and uniqueness of the global solution to system (3.31)-(3.32). This concludes Step 4.

For convenience of the reader we give a complete proof of Step 4. Let us fix an arbitrary large positive number T and use the successive approximation method to solve equations (3.31)-(3.32) on $[0, T]$:

$$(3.33) \quad x_{n+1}(t) = x_0 + \int_0^t B_n(s)\Phi(s, x_n(s))ds, \quad x_0 \in H,$$

$$(3.34) \quad B_{n+1}(t) = B(0) + \int_0^t [\varphi(s, x_n(s))B_n(s) + I]ds, \quad B(0) \in L(H).$$

Since $F'(x)$ and $F''(x)$ are assumed to be bounded in $U(\hat{x}, R\varepsilon(0))$, and $\varepsilon(t)$ is positive on $[0, T]$, for every $t \in [0, T]$ the function $\Phi(s, x)$ has bounded Fréchet derivative with respect to x in $U(\hat{x}, R\varepsilon(0))$. So one has:

$$\begin{aligned} \|B_2\Phi(s, x_2) - B_1\Phi(s, x_1)\| &= \|(B_2 - B_1)\Phi(s, x_2) + B_1(\Phi(s, x_2) - \Phi(s, x_1))\| \\ &\leq A(T)(\|B_2 - B_1\| + \|x_2 - x_1\|) \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $x_1, x_2 \in U(\hat{x}, R\varepsilon(0))$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi(s, x_2)B_2 - \varphi(s, x_1)B_1\| &= \|(\varphi(s, x_2) - \varphi(s, x_1))B_2 + \varphi(s, x_1)(B_2 - B_1)\| \\ &\leq K(T)(\|B_2 - B_1\| + \|x_2 - x_1\|). \end{aligned}$$

Define the norm in a Banach space $H \times L(H)$ as follows:

$$\|(x, B)\| := \|x\| + \|B\|.$$

Thus, if $w_i(t) := (x_i(t), B_i(t))$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$, one gets the estimate

$$\|w_{n+1}(t) - w_n(t)\| \leq \int_0^t \|B_n(s)\Phi(s, x_n(s)) - B_{n-1}(s)\Phi(s, x_{n-1}(s))\| ds$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_0^t \|\varphi(s, x_n(s))B_n(s) - \varphi(s, x_{n-1}(s))B_{n-1}(s)\| ds \\
& \leq \int_0^t (A(T) + K(T))\|w_n(s) - w_{n-1}(s)\| ds \leq \dots \leq \frac{((A(T) + K(T))T)^n}{n!} \text{const}
\end{aligned}$$

valid on the maximal subinterval $[0, T_{max}] := \{t, t \in [0, T] \text{ and } x(t) \in U(\hat{x}, R\varepsilon(0))\}$. Therefore iterative process (3.33)-(3.34) converges uniformly and determines the unique solution $(x(t), B(t))$ of problem (3.31)-(3.32) on $[0, T_{max}]$. If $T_{max} < T$, it follows from the maximality of the subinterval $[0, T_{max}]$ that $x(T_{max})$ is a boundary point of $U(\hat{x}, R\varepsilon(0))$. But, since $\varepsilon(t)$ is monotone, this contradicts the fact that the inequality $\|x(t) - \hat{x}\| < R\varepsilon(t)$ holds whenever $x(t)$ is defined. Hence the unique solution $(x(t), B(t))$ to (2.3)-(2.4) exists on $[0, T]$ for any $T > 0$. Consequently, it exists on $[0, +\infty)$ and (3.5) is satisfied $\forall t \in [0, +\infty)$. Theorem 3.1 is proved. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] Airapetyan, R.G. [2000] *Continuous Newton method and its modification*, Applicable Analysis, **73**, N 3-4, 463-484.
- [2] Airapetyan, R.G., Ramm A.G. and Smirnova, A.B. [1999] *Continuous analog of Gauss-Newton method*, Math. Models and Meth. in Appl. Sci., **9**, N3, 463-474.
- [3] Airapetyan, R.G., Ramm, A.G., Smirnova, A.B. [2000] *Continuous methods for solving nonlinear ill-posed problems*, Operator theory and its applications, Amer. Math.Soc., Providence RI, Fields Inst. Commun., **25**, 111-137.
- [4] Airapetyan, R.G., Ramm, A.G. [2000] *Dynamical systems and discrete methods for solving nonlinear ill-posed problems*, Appl.Math.Reviews, vol. 1, Ed. G. Anastassiou, World Sci. Publishers, pp.491-536.
- [5] Blaschke, B., Neubauer, A. and Scherzer O. [1997] *On convergence rates for the iteratively regularized Gauss-Newton method*, IMA J. Num. Anal., **17**, 421-436.
- [6] Dembo, R.S., Eisenstat, S.C., Steihaug, T. [1982] *Inexact Newton methods*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, **16**, 400-408.
- [7] Dennis, J.E., Schnabel, R.B. [1983] *Numerical Methods for Unconstrained Optimization and Nonlinear Equations*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- [8] Deuffhard, P., Engl, H.W. and Scherzer, O. [1998] *A convergence analysis of iterative methods for the solution of nonlinear ill-posed problems under affinity invariant conditions*, Inv. Probl., **14**, 1081-1106.
- [9] Nocedal, J., Wright, S.J. [1999] *Numerical Optimization*, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [10] Ramm, A.G. and Smirnova, A.B. [1999] *A numerical method for solving nonlinear ill-posed problems*, Nonlinear Funct. Anal. and Optimiz., **20**, N3, pp. 317-332.
- [11] Steihaug, T. [1983] *The conjugate gradient method and trust regions in large scale optimization*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, **20**, 626-637.